

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain in the application. No claims have been amended. Further examination and reconsideration of the application in light of the following comments is respectfully requested.

5

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-13 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Childers, et al. (6,729,734). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 10 includes a "reflective means for receiving light from the light source and *selectively directing* the light between the means for modulating the spectral distribution and the display surface." This limitation is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Childers, et al as the Examiner asserts. Fig. 3 and col. 3, lines 3-5 and lines 10-11 do not disclose where the light from the light source is received by the reflective means and "selectively directed" between the means for modulating the spectral distribution and the display surface. Rather, Fig. 3 illustrates SLM 70 (the reflective means) receiving light from the color light modulator (CLM) 64 (the means for modulating the spectral distribution) and not "selectively directing" the light to the CLM 64 and the screen as Applicant is claiming. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection under 35 USC 102(e) and the allowance of claims 10-13 is respectfully requested.

20

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Childers et al. (6,729,734) in view of Morgan. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as Childers et al. is not a proper reference as stated previously with respect to claims 10-13. Further, Childers et al. is commonly assigned to the same assignee as the instant application, Hewlett Packard Development Co., LLP. Therefore under 35 USC 103(c), 35 USC 103(a) would not apply. In addition, claim 14 is dependent upon claim 10 and is patentable based at least on the patentability of claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) and the allowance of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

30

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-9 and 15-27 were allowed. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowance.

35

The prior art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been reviewed, but is no more pertinent to Applicants' invention than the cited references for the reasons given above.

In summary, claims 1-27 are deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

5 If for any reason the Examiner finds the Application other than in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

10 The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this paper be considered a petition therefore.

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541)715-4197
Fax: (541)715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,

Winthrop D. Childers

By: 

Timothy F. Myers

Patent Attorney

Registration No. 42,919